

1 **Amendment to the Drawing:**

2 Please amend the drawing by adding New Figure 2, as attached hereto (in the
3 Appendix) on a new Drawing Sheet.

4

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-8 are presently pending in this Application and each of claims 1-8 has been rejected. Claims 1 and 2 are being amended. Applicants respectfully request re-consideration and allowance of each of pending claims 1-8.

5 **I. Objection to the Drawings**

 The drawings were objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they fail to adequately show the cushioning units in the dividers as described in the specification. The Examiner alleges that Figure 1 did not adequately illustrate the cushioning unit as recognizable by one of skill in the art. Therefore, Figure 2 has been added to more
10 clearly point out this feature previously described in the original specification.

 Because new Figure 2 adequately shows the cushioning units, the drawing now complies with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.83(a) and therefore the objection to the drawing should be withdrawn.

II. Claim Objections

15 In Paragraph 4 of the Office Action, claims 1-3 were objected to due to informalities. Independent claim 1 has now been amended responsive to the Examiner's suggestion (i.e., "said left and right surface" has been corrected to "said left and right surfaces"). Therefore the objection to claim 1, and to claims 2 and 3 which depend from claim 1, should be withdrawn.

20 **III. Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 112**

 In Paragraph 6 of the Office Action, claim 2 was rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 2 depends from claim 1 which has been amended so that the expression "said component box" of claim 2 now has proper antecedent basis in claim 1. Claim 2 has also been amended for formal matters. The
25 rejection of claim 2 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, should therefore be withdrawn.

IV. Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 103

In Paragraph 9 of the Office Action, claims 1-2 and 4-7 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over USP 4,999,671 to Iizuka in view of Germany 4,330,434 to Nolke and Germany 3,917,874 to Seibert, et al, hereinafter "Seibert".

5 Applicants respectfully submit that these claim rejections are overcome for reasons set forth below.

The rejected claim set includes independent claims 1 and 4. Independent claim 1 recites the features of:

"shock absorbers"

10 "cushioning units being arranged over the surface of said component box support units"; and

15 the component box supports being inclined with respect to the lower plane of the transport cart; i.e., "(4) a cross section between a plane comprising said Y and Z axis and said plane of said component box support units forming a line, said line being parallel with a line created by rotating said positive Y direction in a clockwise direction when facing said plane comprising said Y and Z axis, said rotation being over a displacement of degrees of rotation;"

20 Similarly, independent claim 4 recites the features of "shock absorbers"; "cushioning units"; and the "component box support units being mounted in a plane, said plane of said component box support units slanting in a downward direction with respect to a plane of said platform".

25 The claimed invention is distinguished from the references of record due to the aforementioned features. The reference of Iizuka does not disclose or suggest a) shock absorbers, b) cushioning units, or c) the plane of the box support units inclined or slanting in a downward direction with respect to the plane of the platform of the component transport cart.

lizuka does not disclose any shock absorbers, much less shock absorbers mounted on the second surface of a platform, i.e. on the surface of the platform opposite the surface to which the wheels are attached. No mention is made of shock absorbers in lizuka and the Examiner has not pointed out any feature alleged to be a shock absorber. lizuka does not illustrate or suggest shock absorbers. The German reference of Nolke further does not disclose or suggest shock absorbers. Nolke simply provides a superstructure (1) that is detachably mounted over a chassis. While the chassis and superstructure are not fixedly connected to one another in Nolke, Nolke merely discloses that the superstructure is secured in the chassis against lateral shifting by means of fixing projections, recesses and shoulders. Like lizuka, however, Nolke makes no suggestion of the described mobile cabinet having shock absorbers. The Examiner does not suggest that the reference of Seibert discloses shock absorbers. (The cited reference of Seibert has apparently been relied upon for providing a component transport cart with a plurality of rows of components support units with upper portion dividers provided to provide multiple compartments). Seibert, in fact, does not disclose shock absorbers.

Independent claims 1 and 4 are therefore distinguished from the references of lizuka in view of Nolke and Seibert.

Each of independent claims 1 and 4 also recites the feature of cushioning units and neither of the references of lizuka, Nolke, or Seibert disclose or suggest cushioning units. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's characterization of lizuka's: "cushioning units 23, 25", arranged over the surface of the component support units. Features 23 and 25 of lizuka are clearly ROLLERS; not cushioning units. Applicants respectfully submit that rollers are not inherently cushioning units: in fact; they are clearly distinguished. lizuka takes time to provide rather detailed descriptions of his arrangement and makes no suggestion that roller arrays 23 and 25 serve any other purpose: "and arrangement for detachably holding each cassette holder 5 includes arrays of rolls 23 and 25; a moveable frame 24 for supporting the roller arrays 23 and

25; a library housing portion 26 which functions also as a guide rail; a stopper mechanism 27 mounted on the frame 24 and operable to prevent jounce of the cassette holder 5 within the library; a role 28; and a stopper 29 operable to hold the cassette holder" lizuka, column 8, lines 14-21. Jouncing is prevented because the cassette holder 5 ROLLS over the roller array 23, 25, not because it is cushioned by it. The claimed cushioning units of claims 1 and 4 thereby distinguish applicant's invention from the reference of lizuka. The German references of Nolke and Seibert do not make up for this deficiency of lizuka as they do not disclose or suggest cushioning units and therefore claims 1 and 4 are further distinguished from the references of lizuka, Nolke, and Seibert, taken alone or in combination.

Each of independent claims 1 and 4 also recite the feature that the box supports are inclined with respect to the lower plane of the transport cart, this feature pointed out using different claim language as reproduced above. The downward slant provides the advantage of a reduced likelihood that boxes will slide out of the moveable cart during transport. The references of lizuka, Nolke and Seibert, do not disclose or suggest this feature as apparently conceded by the Examiner by his failure to allege that either of the lizuka, Nolke or Seibert references teaches or suggests this advantageous feature. Independent claims 1 and 4 are therefore further distinguished from the references of lizuka, Nolke and Seibert, taken alone or in combination.

As such, the rejection of claims 1 and 4, and also of claims 2 and 5-7, which depend respectively from claims 1 and 4, should be withdrawn. Claims 1-2 and 4-7 are in allowable form.

In paragraph 10 of the Office Action, claims 3 and 8 were rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over lizuka, as modified and applied to claims 1 and 4 and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,421,113 to Armentrout. Applicants respectfully submit that these claim rejections are overcome for reasons set forth below.

Claims 3 and 8 depend from claims 1 and 4, respectively, which are distinguished from lizuka for reasons set forth above. The cited reference of Armentrout has apparently been relied upon for teaching that it is well known in the reticle carrier industry/field to manufacture the reticle carrier using Anti-Electrostatic Discharge materials in order to prevent ESD damage to the reticle. Armentrout therefore does not make up for the above-stated deficiencies of lizuka and therefore the rejection of claims 3 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over lizuka in view of Armentrout, should be withdrawn. Claims 3 and 8 are also in allowable form.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, each of pending claims 1-8 is in allowable form and the application in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully and expeditiously requested.

5 The Assistant Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge any fees
or credit any excess payment that may be associated with this communication to
deposit account 04-1679.

Respectfully submitted,

10 Dated: 21 SEPT 2005


15 Mark J. Marcelli, Reg. No. 36,593
Attorney for Applicant

Attachment: Appendix with New Drawing sheet (Fig. 2)

20 DUANE MORRIS LLP
101 West Broadway, Suite 900
San Diego, CA 92101
Telephone: (619) 744-2200
Facsimile: (619) 744-2201

Appl. No. **09/934,549**

Amdt. dated 09/21/2005

Response to Office Action of 07/29/2005

Attorney Docket No.: TS01-285

N1085-90132

APPENDIX